

PATENT

Attorney Docket no.: 2855/110

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS : Xiaofang ZHANG et al.
SERIAL NO. : 10/775,658
FILED : February 9, 2004
FOR : ELECTRICAL CURRENT MEASUREMENTS AT
HEAD-DISK INTERFACE
GROUP ART UNIT : 2627
EXAMINER : Varsha A. KAPADIA

M/S: APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

REPLY BRIEF

Dear Sir:

This is in reply to issues raised by the Examiner in his Answer of June 9, 2008.

Application No.: 10/683,927
Filing date: February 9, 2004
Appellant(s): Xiaofeng ZHANG et al.
Group: 2627
Reply Brief dated: August 11, 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Appellants believe that the Examiner's conclusions in the Answer are incorrect for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-15, and 17, the Examiner has asserted Muranushi describes a current measurement device comprising a voltage source to supply power to a magnetic head, citing Figure 7, elements 1-5 and disclosure thereof. *See* Office Action dated 10/12/2007, page 2. Appellants disagree.

As argued previously in the Appeal Brief, Figure 7, and its description, describes element 4 as a "current measuring device" and element 5 as a "voltage source". *See e.g.*, column 6, line 54 – column 7, line 24. As illustrated in Figure 7, the current measurement device (element 4) is separate and distinct from voltage source (element 5). Moreover, the description of Muranushi affirms this as well. *See e.g.*, column 6, line 64 – column 7, line 7. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, element 4 is not "part of" element 5, and nowhere is the teaching or suggestion that they are the same or one is included as part of the other element. Appellants submit the cited Figure 7 (and its description) fails to teach or suggest at least a current measurement device that is an ammeter/voltage source.

In response, the Examiner asserts that although element 4 is identified as a current measurement device, one of ordinary skill in the art can broadly construe it to include the separate voltage source 5. The Office Action offers no support from the reference for this assertion, and Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed above, the cited reference teaches against such an assertion.

Application No.: 10/683,927
Filing date: February 9, 2004
Appellant(s): Xiaofeng ZHANG et al.
Group: 2627
Reply Brief dated: August 11, 2008

The Examiner further asserts that a voltage source by itself cannot measure current and Appellants do not disclose that it could. Applicants submit a device that is an ammeter/voltage source (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1) is described in multiple places throughout the specification. *See* paragraph [0025], line 5-7 and paragraph [0028]. Therefore, since the relevant limitations of claim 1 are supported by the specification, they should be considered. Since, upon consideration, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest the relevant limitations (for at least the reasons described above and in the Appeal Brief), the current rejection is lacking and should be withdrawn.

Frater fails teach the relevant limitations as well. Frater is directed to measuring characteristics of a magnetic recording head which is flying in an air bearing relationship over a rotating magnetic recording disk. *See e.g.*, Figures 2A, 2B, 3, 4, 5. Moreover, as described in column 2, line 58, the cited reference merely describes integrating an ammeter A to measure current. However, as argued previously, the Frater reference fails to teach or describe at least a current measurement device that is an ammeter/voltage source, as described, for example, in claim 1.

For at least the reasons described above, the rejection of claim 1 is lacking. Appellant submit claim 1 is allowable; independent claims 3, 9 and 15-17 contain similar allowable subject matter, and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 2, 4-6, 8-14 are allowable for depending from allowable base claims.

Appellants therefore respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 1-6 and 8-17.

Application No.: 10/683,927
Filing date: February 9, 2004
Appellant(s): Xiaofeng ZHANG et al.
Group: 2627
Reply Brief dated: August 11, 2008

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7950 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: August 11, 2008

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501